



REMARKS ON SCHRÖDINGER OPERATORS  
WITH VECTOR POTENTIALS\*

Tosio Kato

Three selfadjoint realizations  $H_0 \geq H \geq H'$  of the formal Schrödinger operator in  $R^m$  with a singular vector potential  $b(x)$  and a singular scalar potential  $q(x)$  are constructed through quadratic forms, corresponding to the minimal, intermediate, and maximal forms. It is shown that if  $b \in L^2_{loc}$  and  $0 \leq q \in L^1_{loc}$ , then  $H_0 = H$  and the pointwise domination  $|e^{-tH}u| \leq e^{t\Delta}|u|$  holds for  $t \geq 0$  and  $u \in L^2$ . If in addition  $b \in L^p_{loc}$  with some  $p > m$ , then  $H' = H$  holds.

1. Introduction.

Consider the formal Schrödinger operator in  $R^m$  :

$$(T) \quad T = -(V-ib(x))^2 + q(x) = -\sum_{k=1}^m (d_k - ib_k(x))^2 + q(x),$$

where  $d_k = d/dx_k$ ,  $b = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$  is a real vector-valued function, and  $q$  is a real scalar-valued function on  $R^m$ .

\*This work was partially supported by NSF Grant MCS 76-04655.

It was shown by Simon [5] that under certain conditions, a selfadjoint realization  $H$  of  $T$  in  $\underline{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$  can be constructed with the property, among others, that

$$(P) \quad |e^{-tH}u| \leq e^{t\Delta}|u| \quad \text{a.e. pointwise on } \mathbb{R}^m,$$

where  $t \geq 0$ ,  $u \in \underline{H}$ , and  $\Delta$  denotes the canonical realization in  $\underline{H}$  of the Laplacian (with domain  $\underline{D}(\Delta) = H^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , the Sobolev space). Simon assumes, for example, that  $b \in L^4_{loc}$ ,  $\operatorname{div} b = 0$  and  $q = 0$ , for  $m = 3$ , but conjectures that  $b \in L^2_{loc}$  would suffice. (See [5] for various consequences of (P). See also Schechter [3] and Simon [4] for the essential selfadjointness of  $T$ .)

In what follows we shall prove (P) under the assumptions

$$(A1) \quad b \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^m)^m,$$

$$(A2) \quad 0 \leq q \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^m),$$

thus verifying Simon's conjecture. Note that we assume nothing about  $\operatorname{div} b$ .

The definition of  $H$  is by no means trivial in this case, however, and several different choices are possible. We define  $H$  through quadratic forms (as Simon does), but this statement is still vague. To be more precise, it is convenient to define a linear operator  $D'$  from  $\underline{H}$  to  $\underline{H}^m$  by

$$(1.1) \quad D'u = \nabla u - ibu.$$

The domain  $\underline{D}(D')$  of  $D'$  consists of all  $u \in \underline{H}$  for which the right member of (1.1), taken in the distribution sense, belongs to  $\underline{H}^m$ . It is essential here that  $bu \in L^1_{loc}$  by (A1) so that (1.1) makes sense as a distribution.

It is easy to see that  $D'$  thus defined is a densely defined, closed operator from  $\underline{H}$  to  $\underline{H}^m$ . Thus

$$(1.2) \quad B' = D'^*D'$$

is selfadjoint in  $\underline{H}$ . We then define

$$(1.3) \quad H' = B' + q \quad (\text{form sum}),$$

which means that  $H'$  is the selfadjoint operator associated with the densely defined, closed quadratic form

$$(1.4) \quad h'[u] = \|D'u\|^2 + \|q^{1/2}u\|^2$$

with domain  $\underline{D}(h') = \underline{D}(D') \cap \underline{D}(q^{1/2})$ , where  $q$  is regarded as a nonnegative selfadjoint operator in  $\underline{H}$ .

The quadratic form  $h'$  may be called the maximal form associated with  $T$ . We define the minimal form  $h_0$  as the closure of the restriction of  $h'$  to domain  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , and the associated operator  $H_0$ . There is another form  $h$  of practical interest, such that

$$(1.5) \quad h_0 \subset h \subset h' ;$$

$h$  is obtained from  $h'$  by restricting its domain to  $\underline{D}(D) \cap \underline{D}(q^{1/2})$ , where  $D$  is the closure of the restriction of  $D'$  to  $C_0^\infty$ . In other words,  $h$  is obtained by first letting  $u \in C_0^\infty$  in (1.4), closing the two forms on the right separately and then taking the sum, whereas  $h_0$  is obtained by closing the sum for  $u \in C_0^\infty$ . The operator  $H$  associated with  $h$  may thus be written

$$(1.6) \quad H = B + q, \quad B = D^*D,$$

with  $D$  as defined above. Note that  $D$  is the minimal, and  $D'$  is the maximal, operator for  $\nabla$ -ib.

We note that (1.5) implies

$$(1.7) \quad H_0 \geq H \geq H'$$

in the sense of order relation for semibounded operators (see [1, Chapter 6]).

If  $b$  and  $q$  are well-behaved, the three operators  $H_0$ ,  $H$ , and  $H'$  are identical. In general, there is no obvious reason why this should be the case. (cf. [1, Chapter 6, Section 1.6]).

The main results to be proved in this paper are

THEOREM I.  $H_0 = H$ .

THEOREM II. (P) is true for  $H$ .

We have no results regarding  $H'$  under the assumptions (A1), (A2), but we have

THEOREM III. If (A1) is replaced by the stronger condition that  $b \in L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^m)^m$  for some  $p > m$ , then  $H' = H = H_0$ .

REMARK 1.1. In [5] Simon sets  $q = 0$  and chooses  $H$  (rather than  $H'$ ) as the definition of the Hamiltonian. To prove (P), however, he assumes that  $b \in L_{loc}^4(\mathbb{R}^3)^3$ ; then  $H' = H$  is true by Theorem III.

REMARK 1.2. Theorems I to III can be extended to the case when  $q$  is nonreal but satisfies  $|\text{Im } q| \leq M \text{Re } q \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$  instead of (A2), where  $M < \infty$  is a constant. In this case the operator  $q$  is  $m$ -sectorial (see [1, Chapters 5,6]), and the forms  $h_0$ ,  $h$ ,  $h'$  can be defined as above with obvious modifications. The proofs given below are valid in this case too, due to a generalization of the product formula by Simon (see [2]).

The proofs of the theorems are given in the following sections. After a preliminary study of the operator  $D$  (section 2), we first prove Theorem II when  $q = 0$  (so that  $H = B$ ) (section 3), and then in the general case using the Trotter product formula (section 4). Theorem I is proved

using Theorem II (section 5). Theorem III is proved in the last section.

## 2. The operator D.

It is important to know when a given  $u \in \underline{H}$  is in  $\underline{D}(D)$ .

LEMMA 2.1. Let  $u \in \underline{H} \cap H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^m) \cap L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$  so that  
 $v = \nabla u - ibu \in L_{loc}^2$ . If  $v \in \underline{H}^m$ , then  $u \in \underline{D}(D)$  and  
 $Du = v$ .

Proof. The assumption implies that  $u \in \underline{D}(D')$ . We first truncate  $u$  by setting  $u_n = \phi_n u$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $\phi_n(x) = \phi(x/n)$  and  $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$  with  $\phi = 1$  identically near the origin. Then  $u_n \rightarrow u$  in  $\underline{H}$  and  $D'u_n = \phi_n v + (\nabla \phi_n)u \rightarrow v$  in  $\underline{H}^m$ . Hence it suffices to show that  $u_n \in \underline{D}(D)$ .

$w = u_n$  has the properties that

$w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^m) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , with compact support.

Thus it suffices to show that any such  $w$  is in  $\underline{D}(D)$ .

Let  $w_\varepsilon = J_\varepsilon w$ , where  $J_\varepsilon$  is the Friedrichs mollifier, so that  $w_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$  with a common compact support,  $|w_\varepsilon| \leq M < \infty$  pointwise, and  $w_\varepsilon \rightarrow w$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . We have also  $w_\varepsilon \rightarrow w$  a.e. pointwise along some sequence  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ . Thus  $\nabla w_\varepsilon \rightarrow \nabla w$  and  $bw_\varepsilon \rightarrow bw$  in  $\underline{H}^m$  along the sequence. (The latter follows by dominated convergence theorem.) Hence  $D'w_\varepsilon \rightarrow D'w$  in  $\underline{H}^m$ . Since  $w_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty \subset \underline{D}(D)$ , we conclude that  $w \in \underline{D}(D)$ .

## 3. The operator B.

THEOREM 3.1. (P) is true for  $H$  replaced by  $B$ .

Proof. This is known if  $b$  is smooth, say  $b \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$ ; see [5] for the proof. We shall prove Theorem 3.1 by a

limiting process, approximating  $b$  with a sequence  $b_n$  of smooth functions such that

$$(3.1) \quad b_n \rightarrow b \text{ in } L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^m)^m, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let  $D_n$  and  $B_n = D_n^* D_n$  be defined as above with  $b$  replaced by  $b_n$ . Since (P) is true for  $H$  replaced by  $B_n$  as remarked above, Theorem 3.1 will follow if we can show that  $e^{-tB_n} \rightarrow e^{-tB}$  strongly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . As is well known, for this it suffices to prove

LEMMA 3.2.  $(1+B_n)^{-1} \rightarrow (1+B)^{-1}$  strongly,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Since  $\|(1+B_n)^{-1}\| \leq 1$ , it suffices to show that

$$(3.2) \quad u_n = (1+B_n)^{-1}f \rightarrow (1+B)^{-1}f$$

for all  $f$  in a dense set in  $\underline{H}$ . Thus we may assume that  $f \in \underline{H} \cap L^\infty$ . The proof will be given in several steps.

LEMMA 3.3.  $\|u_n\| \leq \|f\|$ ,  $\|D_n u_n\| \leq \|f\|$ , and  $|u_n| \leq g < M < \infty$  pointwise, where  $g \in \underline{H} \cap L^\infty$  is independent of  $n$ .

Proof. (3.2) implies

$$(3.3) \quad f = (1+B_n)u_n.$$

Hence

$$(f, u_n) = \|u_n\|^2 + \|D_n u_n\|^2$$

because  $B_n = D_n^* D_n$ . The first two inequalities in the lemma follow immediately. To prove the last one, we note that the results of [5] apply to  $B_n$ . Hence (see [5, equation (6)])

$$|u_n| = |(1+B_n)^{-1}f| \leq (1-\Delta)^{-1}|f| \equiv g \in \underline{H} \cap L^\infty \text{ pointwise;}$$

note that  $g \in L^\infty$  because  $f \in L^\infty$ .

LEMMA 3.4.  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded in  $H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$  .

Proof. We have  $\nabla u_n = D_n u_n + i b_n u_n$  by (1.1). In view of Lemma 3.3 and the fact that the  $L^2$ -norm on any bounded set in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  of the  $b^n$  are bounded by (3.1), the lemma follows immediately.

LEMMA 3.5.  $\{u_n\}$  contains a subsequence (hereafter denoted again by  $\{u_n\}$ ) such that there is  $u \in \underline{H} \cap H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^m) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$  with the properties:  $u_n \rightarrow u$  in  $\underline{H}$  as well as a.e. pointwise, and  $u_n \rightharpoonup u$  in  $H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . ( $\rightharpoonup$  denotes weak convergence.)

Proof. In view of Lemma 3.4, one can use the diagonal process to extract a subsequence  $\{u_n\}$  weakly convergent in  $H_{loc}^1$  to a  $u \in H_{loc}^1$ . This implies  $u_n \rightarrow u$  in  $L_{loc}^2$  strongly, by Rellich's theorem. Since  $|u_n| \leq g \in \underline{H} \cap L^\infty$  by Lemma 3.3, we have  $u \in \underline{H} \cap L^\infty$  and  $u_n \rightarrow u$  in  $\underline{H}$ .

LEMMA 3.6.  $b_n u_n \rightarrow bu$  in  $L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^m)^m$  .

Proof. We have  $b_n u_n - bu = (b_n - b)u_n + b(u_n - u)$ . Since  $|u_n| \leq M$ ,  $(b_n - b)u_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_{loc}^2$  by (3.1). Since  $|b(u_n - u)| \leq 2M|b|$ ,  $b(u_n - u) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_{loc}^2$  by dominated convergence.

LEMMA 3.7.  $u = (1+B)^{-1}f$  .

Proof. Let  $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . (3.3) implies

$$(3.4) \quad (f, \phi) = (u_n, \phi) + (D_n u_n, D_n \phi) .$$

But

$$(3.5) \quad D_n \phi = \nabla \phi - i b_n \phi \rightarrow \nabla \phi - i b \phi = D \phi \text{ in } \underline{H}^m$$

by (3.1). Similarly

$$D_n u_n = \nabla u_n - i b_n u_n \rightharpoonup \nabla u - i b u \quad \text{in } L^2_{loc}$$

by Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6. Hence

$$\|\nabla u - i b u\|_{\Omega} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|D_n u_n\| \leq \|f\| \quad ,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{\Omega}$  denotes the  $L^2$ -norm on a bounded set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ . Since this is true for any such  $\Omega$ , we have  $\nabla u - i b u \in \underline{H}^m$ . Since  $u \in H^1_{loc} \cap L^{\infty}$ , it follows from Lemma 2.1 that  $u \in \underline{D}(D)$  with  $Du = \nabla u - i b u$ . Thus

$$(3.6) \quad D_n u_n \rightharpoonup Du \in \underline{H}^m \quad \text{in } L^2_{loc} \quad .$$

Since  $\phi$  and the  $D_n \phi$  have a common compact support, it follows from (3.4-6) that  $(f, \phi) = (u, \phi) + (Du, D\phi)$ . Since this is true for all  $\phi \in C_0^{\infty}$ , which is a core for  $D$ , we conclude that  $Bu = D^* Du$  exists and equals  $f - u$ . Hence  $(1+B)u = f$  and  $u = (1+B)^{-1}f$ . This completes the proof of Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 3.1.

#### 4. The operator $H$ .

We can now complete the proof of Theorem II. Since  $H = B \dagger q$ , a general convergence theorem for the Trotter product formula given in [2] can be applied to give

$$(4.1) \quad e^{-tH} u = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [e^{-(t/n)B} e^{-(t/n)q}]^n u \quad , \quad u \in \underline{H} \quad .$$

Lemma 4.1. For  $s \geq 0$  and  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , we have

$$(4.2) \quad |(e^{-sB} e^{-sq})^n u| \leq e^{ns\Delta} |u| \quad \underline{\text{pointwise}} \quad .$$

Proof. By induction. (4.2) is obvious for  $n = 0$ . Suppose it is true for an  $n$ . Then, writing  $v = (e^{-sB} e^{-sq})^n u$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |(e^{-sB} e^{-sq})^{n+1} u| &= |e^{-sB} e^{-sq} v| \leq e^{s\Delta} |e^{-sq} v| \\ &\leq e^{s\Delta} |v| \leq e^{s\Delta} (e^{ns\Delta} |u|) = e^{(n+1)s\Delta} |u| \quad , \end{aligned}$$



where we have used Theorem 3.1, the positivity preserving property of  $e^{s\Delta}$  twice, and (4.2) (induction hypothesis).

Lemma 4.1 shows that the vector following lim sign in (4.1) is dominated by  $e^{t\Delta}|u|$  pointwise. Hence (P) follows as required.

### 5. The operator $H_0$ .

We now prove Theorem I. It suffices to show that  $h_0 = h$ , and this is true if (and only if)  $h$  has a core contained in  $\underline{D}(h_0)$ . We shall show that  $\underline{E} = (1+H)^{-1}C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$  is such a core. Obviously  $\underline{E}$  is a core for  $H$ , hence for  $h$  too. It remains to show that  $\underline{E} \in \underline{D}(h_0)$ .

Let  $u \in \underline{E}$ , so that  $u = (1+H)^{-1}f$  for some  $f \in C_0^\infty$ . Then

$$(5.1) \quad |u| \leq (1-\Delta)^{-1}|f| \in \underline{H} \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$$

by Theorem II, which implies such a pointwise domination by [5]. Then we can repeat the arguments used in the proof of Lemma 2.1 to construct, by truncation and mollification, a sequence  $\{w_n\}$  such that

$$(5.2) \quad w_n \in C_0^\infty, \quad w_n \rightarrow w \quad \text{and} \quad Dw_n \rightarrow Dw \quad \text{in} \quad \underline{H} .$$

On the other hand, we have  $u \in \underline{D}(H) \subset \underline{D}(h) \subset \underline{D}(q^{1/2})$  so that  $q^{1/2}u \in \underline{H}$ . Recalling that the  $w_n$  have been constructed by truncation and mollification from  $u$ , which is a bounded function by (5.1), we see easily by dominated convergence theorem that

$$(5.3) \quad q^{1/2}(w_n - u) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \underline{H} ,$$

by going over to a subsequence if necessary. (Here the fact that  $q^{1/2}u \in \underline{H}$  is essential for truncation, and  $u \in L^\infty$  is essential for mollification.)

It follows from (5.2-3) that

$$h[w_n - u] = \|D(w_n - u)\|^2 + \|q^{1/2}(w_n - u)\|^2 \rightarrow 0 .$$

Since  $w_n \in C_0^\infty$ , this proves  $u \in \underline{D}(h_0)$  as required.

### 6. The operator $H'$ .

We now prove Theorem III. It suffices to show that  $D' \subset D$  (so that  $D' = D$ ). Let  $u \in \underline{D}(D')$ .

We truncate  $u$  to  $u_n = \phi_n u$  as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. Then  $u_n \rightarrow u$  and  $D'u_n \rightarrow D'u$  in  $\underline{H}$ . Thus it suffices to show  $u_n \in \underline{D}(D)$ .

$w = u_n$  has the property that it has compact support and  $w \in \underline{H}$ ,  $D'w \in \underline{H}$ . We shall show that all such  $w$  are in  $\underline{D}(D)$ . We have

$$\forall w = D'w + ibw \in L^{p_1}, \quad p_1^{-1} = 2^{-1} + p^{-1} ,$$

because  $D'w \in L^2$ ,  $b \in L_{loc}^p$ ,  $w \in L^2$  and  $w$  has compact support. It follows from the Sobolev imbedding theorem that

$$w \in L^{p_2}, \quad p_2^{-1} = p_1^{-1} - m^{-1} = 2^{-1} - \theta$$

where  $\theta = m^{-1} - p^{-1} > 0$ , provided  $p_2 < \infty$ . This argument can be repeated until we have

$$\forall w \in L^2, \quad w \in L^{p_0}, \quad p_0^{-1} = 2^{-1} - m^{-1}$$

if  $m \geq 3$ ,  $w \in L^r$  for any  $r < \infty$  if  $m = 2$ , and  $w \in L^\infty$  if  $m = 1$ .

Now we mollify  $w$  to  $w_\varepsilon$  as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. Then  $\forall w_\varepsilon \rightarrow \forall w$  in  $\underline{H}$  and  $w_\varepsilon \rightarrow w$  in  $L^{p_0}$ , hence  $bw_\varepsilon \rightarrow bw$  in  $L^s$  where  $s^{-1} = p_0^{-1} + p^{-1} = 2^{-1} - \theta$  so that  $bw_\varepsilon \rightarrow bw$  in  $\underline{H}$  too (with slight modifications for  $m \leq 2$ ). Thus  $D'w_\varepsilon \rightarrow D'w$  in  $\underline{H}$ . Since  $w_\varepsilon \in C_0^\infty$  and  $w_\varepsilon \rightarrow w$  in  $\underline{H}$ , we have proved that  $w \in \underline{D}(D)$ .

REFERENCES

- [1] Kato, T.: Perturbation theory for linear operators, Second Edition, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, Springer 1976.
- [2] Kato, T.: Trotter's product formula for an arbitrary pair of selfadjoint contraction semigroups, Advances in Math., to appear.
- [3] Schechter, M.: Essential self-adjointness of the Schrödinger operator with magnetic vector potential, J. Functional Anal. 20 (1975), 93-104.
- [4] Simon, B.: Schrödinger operators with singular magnetic vector potentials, Math. Z. 131 (1973), 361-370.
- [5] Simon, B.: Kato's inequality and the comparison of semigroups, to appear.

Tosio Kato  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA. 94720, USA